

## **REMARKS**

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the application be forwarded on to issuance.

### 5           **Interview Summary**

Applicant's attorney, Michael Colby, wishes to thank Qing Yuan Wu for a telephonic interview on June 5<sup>th</sup>, 2007.

During the interview, Applicant's attorney and the Examiner discussed the Patterson and Stein references. The Examiner was kind enough to indicate amendments  
10 to the independent claims that, subject to an additional search and additional analysis of the claims, were likely allowable over the art of record as understood by Applicant's attorney.

Accordingly, the independent claims have been amended herein, as discussed during the interview. Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for  
15 allowance. If any issues remain that would prevent the allowance of the application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issues.

### **Claim Objection**

20           The Office objected to claim 16 for an informality. Applicant corrects this informality as provided above.

### **Rejections under § 101**

25           Claims 1-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding claims 1, 10, 18, and their respective dependent claims, the Office argues that these claims are apparatus claims but are directed to software alone without claiming associated computer hardware required for execution. Applicant amends these claims to include computer hardware as required by the Office.

30           Also regarding claims 1, 10, and 18 the Office rejects the claims on other grounds but under the assumption that they are not apparatus claims. As these claims are

amended as requested by the Office to be considered proper apparatus claims by the Office, the grounds for these other rejections are obviated by these amendments.

### **Rejections under § 112**

5            Claims 9, 17, 19, 21, 28, 36, and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Regarding claim 21, to which the Office rejects for language reciting “the interfacing”, Applicant respectfully submits that this language is clear and commonly used. To expedite prosecution, however,  
10    Applicant amends claim 21 to recite “the act of interfacing with a manipulation tool library comprises interfacing”, thereby obviating the Office’s ground for this rejection.

Regarding the rejections of the other claims, Applicant cancels them without prejudice.

### **Rejections under § 102**

15            Claims 1, 3, 9, 20, 22, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2003/0236775 to Patterson et al. (“Patterson”).

### **Rejections under § 103**

20            Claims 2, 4, 5, 21, 23, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patterson as applied to claims 1 and 20 above.

Claims 6-8, 10-19, 25-27, and 29-38, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patterson as applied to claims 1 and 20 above, in view of U.S. Patent 5,896,495 to Stein et al. (“Stein”).

25

### **Response to 102 and 103 Rejections**

Applicant amends all of the independent claims as suggested by the Office and as noted above. Applicant respectfully submits that the amended language added to these claims obviates the grounds for the Office’s rejections. The Office has not shown, for  
30    example, that Patterson (or Patterson in combination with Stein) anticipates or renders obvious “event handling logic configured to monitor a firing of the user interface object”

and execute a callback function upon the occurrence of a specified event caused by the firing of the user interface object, the callback function executing a prescribed function upon the occurrence of the specified event” as currently amended into claim 1 and as

similarly included in other independent claims rejected herein. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its rejections of these claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that the dependent claims relying on these independent claims are allowable as relying on an allowable base claim and for their own recited features.

### **Conclusion**

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Office issue a Notice of Allowability. If the Office’s next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 26 July 2007

By: /Michael K. Colby/  
Michael K. Colby  
Reg. No. 45,816  
(509) 755-7254